

App. No. 09/788,225
Amendment Dated March 4, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of February 14, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

An informal Examiner Interview was held on March, 3, 2005. During that interview, applicants' attorney and Examiner Luu discussed the patentability of the claims over the prior art. Examiner Luu suggested that the claims further clarify "address" terminology, "flag" terminology, and the association of the address and the transport. As more fully set forth below, claims 1-19 remain in this application for further review. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 17 and 19 have been amended as set forth above in hopes of obviating the Examiner's concerns with the same. No new matter has been added.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,185,603 issued to Henderson et al. (hereinafter "Henderson"). Even though applicants disagree with the rejection, applicants have amended the claims as set forth above to clarify the invention in hopes of expediting this matter. Applicants' amended claim 1 specifically recites the following elements that are not taught or otherwise suggested by Henderson:

"receiving data including at least one recipient address that indicates a destination for the message." (Emphasis added).

"for each recipient address in the data, determining a transport to deliver the message based on characters of the recipient address, and setting a flag associated with the message to indicate the determined transport." (Emphasis added).

Applicants' amended claim 12 specifically recites the following elements that are not taught or otherwise suggested by Henderson:

"an address processor that uses the characters of the at least one address to determine a candidate transport to deliver the message, wherein the address

App. No. 09/788,225
Amendment Dated March 4, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of February 14, 2005

processor indicates the candidate transport to deliver the message by *associating a flag with the message.*" (Emphasis added).

"*a transport that uses the flag* to determine if it should deliver the message, and if so, delivers the message." (Emphasis added).

Applicants' amended claim 17 specifically recites the following elements that are not taught or otherwise suggested by Henderson:

"means for receiving data including at least one address *that identifies a destination for the message.*" (Emphasis added).

"*for each address* in the data, means for determining a transport to deliver the message using *characters of the address*, and means for setting a flag associated with the message to indicate the determined transport." (Emphasis added).

Applicants' amended claim 19 specifically recites the following elements that are not taught or otherwise suggested by Henderson:

"receiving at least one *recipient address that identifies a destination of the message.*" (Emphasis added).

"*for each address, determining a transport to deliver the message wherein the transport is determined from characters of the address, and sending the message using the transport determined by the characters of the address.*" (Emphasis added).

Henderson teaches inputting a code that invokes an escape sequence. *Henderson*, at col. 6, lines 10-15. The code is not an address or any portion of an address but a separate command by the user. In the pager example, the user inputs the command "!#page" into the subject line of an e-mail message. *Henderson*, at col. 8, lines 37-55. The IMP server, then, must recognize the command "!#page." *Henderson*, at col. 8, lines 37-55. Next, the IMP server matches the recipients c-mail address to a pager number in a database. *Henderson*, at col. 8, lines 37-55. Next, the subject line is forwarded from the e-mail to the pager. (Col. 8, lines 37-55). Contrary to the assertions in the current office action, the code "#page" is not an address as specifically

App. No. 09/788,225
Amendment Dated March 4, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of February 14, 2005

recited in the above claims and defined in the specification of the present invention; it is a command used to tell the computer to evoke an escape sequence.

Moreover, Henderson does not teach determining a transport from characters of an address. Again, Henderson teaches inputting a command that invokes an escape sequence. *Henderson*, at col. 6, lines 10-15. The commands (i.e. !#page) are not associated with an address in any manner. Henderson specifically teaches as follows:

"One advantageous embodiment of the apparatus of the present invention includes a pager server, a facsimile server and or a voice mail server, which are coupled to the message server. This permits the sender to route the message to either a pager, a facsimile or a voice mail system *by specifying the routing within the subject line following the escape sequence*, in addition to the normal recipient." *Henderson*, at col. 3, lines 4-10. (Emphasis added).

Henderson further defines a predefined escape sequence (e.g., !#) and states that the character sequences should be such that it is not invoked inadvertently by the user when simply entering a subject for a normal email message. See *Henderson*, at col. 5, lines 8-15. Applicants assert that Henderson teaches away from the limitations of the present invention and applicants believe that independent claims 1, 12, 17 and 19 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Claims 3-11, 13, 15-16 and 18 are dependent claims, which ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 12 and 17, respectively. Applicants assert that the limitations of claims 3-11, 13, 15-16 and 18 are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited art. Furthermore, insofar as claims 3-11, 13, 15-16 and 18 depend from claims 1, 12 and 17 the same are thought to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application,

03-04-05 11:31AM FROM-MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

206-342-6201


T-639 P.012/012 F-706

App. No. 09/788,225
Amendment Dated March 4, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of February 14, 2005

the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Ryan T. Grace
Registration No. 52,956
Direct Dial: 206.342.6257

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200



Page 9 of 9